



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/878,874	06/11/2001	Tony McCormack	41319-904926	2638
23644	7590	08/18/2009	EXAMINER	
BARNES & THORNBURG LLP			PATEL, HARESH N	
P.O. BOX 2786				
CHICAGO, IL 60690-2786			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2454	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/18/2009	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Patent-ch@btlaw.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/878,874	MCCORMACK ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	HARESH N. PATEL	2454

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                  2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 11, 19-21, 25 and 27-30 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-7, 10, 11, 19-21, 25 and 27 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 8 and 28 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-8, 10, 11, 19-21, 25 and 27-28 are subject to examination. Claims 8 and 28 are allowable but objected to.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Drozdzewicz et al. 2002/0091769 (Hereinafter Drozdzewics), as per office action dated 1/13/2009.
4. Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jonsson 6,272,214 (Hereinafter Jonsson), as per office action dated 1/13/2009.
5. Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Doganata 6,798,753 (Hereinafter Doganata) , as per office action dated 1/13/2009.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-3, 11, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summers et al., 6,876,734, eMeeting.net Inc., (Hereinafter Summers-eMeeting) in view of Linden et al., 6,549,773, Nokia Mobile Phones Limited (Hereinafter Linden-Nokia) , as per office action dated 1/13/2009.

8. Claims 4 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summers-eMeeting in view of Linden-Nokia and in further view of Higgins et al., U. S. Publication 2002/0116505, Sun Microsystems (Hereinafter Higgins-Sun) , as per office action dated 1/13/2009.

9. Claims 5, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summers-eMeeting in view of Linden-Nokia and in further view of Lippert et al., 6,626,957, Microsoft Corporation (Hereinafter Lippert-Microsoft), as per office action dated 1/13/2009.

10. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summers-eMeeting in view of Linden-Nokia and in further view of Voit et al., 6,215,790, Bell Atlantic, (Hereinafter Voit-Bell Atlantic), as per office action dated 1/13/2009.

11. Claims 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summers-eMeeting in view of Linden-Nokia and in further view of Yiu et al., 2003/0181205, Openwave, (Hereinafter Yiu-Openwave).

12. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Summers-eMeeting in view of Linden-Nokia and further in view of Low et al., 6,798,771, Hewlett Packard (Hereinafter Low-Hewlett).

***Response to Arguments***

13. Applicant's arguments filed 5/13/09, pages 6-9, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection of the rejected claims is maintained.

Regarding the applicant's concerns about examiner's explanation/comments for cite limitations in the reference; Drozdzewicz et al. is barely of any relevance to the subject-matter of the independent claims of this application beyond the fact that it relates to establishing telephone calls using a web-enabled conferencing system. Jonsson et al. relates to a method for implementing an automated teleconference, ..., In fact, time is only mentioned in the context of column 5, lines 13 to 15, which indicate that a session may be scheduled to occur at a specific date and time. Doganata et al discloses a method of automatically establishing a conference call, ..., Again, time is only mentioned in the same context as in Jonsson et al., namely to indicate that a session may be scheduled to occur at a specific date and time, Taking each of the sections of Summers et al. cited by the examiner in turn: column 3, lines 27 to 54 does not disclose receiving

a request comprising information about a plurality of call destinations and associated time ranges, etc.; the examiner respectfully disagrees. It is not the examiner's explanation/comments that is rejections are based on rather the evidence that has been used for the rejections, i.e., the cited prior art. Mere arguments and comments cannot alter the evidence, i.e., presented prior art. Further, the relied upon disclosure and the teachings of the Drozdzewicz, Jonsson, Doganata, Jonsson, Summers are not limited as concluded by the applicant. The respective prior art discloses the broadly claimed limitations, i.e., please see the cited portions among other places of the cited art that not only contain the applicant concerned content of the art but also the relied upon limitations. The specification of the application under prosecution at page 14, states, Any range or device value given herein may be extended or altered without losing the effect sought, as will be apparent to the skilled person for an understanding of the teachings herein. A range of applications are within the scope of the invention. These comprise situations in which it is required to create and send uniform resource identifiers (URIs) that comprise time information or to set up telephone calls automatically at times specified in such URIs. Further, when reviewing a reference the applicants should remember that not only the specific teachings of a reference but also reasonable inferences which the artisan would have logically drawn therefrom may be properly evaluated in formulating a rejection. **In re Preda, 401 F. 2d 825, 159 USPQ 342 (CCPA 1968)** and **In re Shepard, 319 F. 2d 194, 138 USPQ 148 (CCPA 1963)**. Skill in the art is presumed. **In re Sovish, 769 F. 2d 738, 226 USPQ 771 (Fed. Cir. 1985)**. Every reference relies to some extent on knowledge of persons skilled in the art to complement that which is disclosed therein. **In re Bode, 550 F. 2d 656, 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA 1977)**.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 8 and 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

14. It has been over a year since claims 8 and 28 has been indicated allowable to the applicant, and hence considering prolonged prosecution, in order to expedite the prosecution of this case, multiple references are used for the rejections to demonstrate that several references disclose the claimed subject matter of the rejected claims.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Examiner has cited particular columns and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Haresh N. Patel/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454

8/14/09